

Economic Growth Challenge / Innovation Incentive: Implementing the Incentive

March 27, 2006

Distinguished, effective, and efficient doctoral programs are critical for Ohio. Most recently, doctoral programs in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine have gained particular importance to the state's economic growth because of their direct support of the Third Frontier Project. Such programs compete for the greater part of federal and other external grants that bring funding to Ohio, stimulate discovery, and deliver innovations to industry. The faculty in such doctoral programs educate well-qualified students who take a direct role in Ohio's economic growth. Finally, many such programs provide foundations for the origination and development of start-up enterprises. Doctoral programs in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine are, however, very resource-intensive. Successful enhancement of such programs requires an increased investment of resources that is sustained over time.

Economic Growth Challenge / Innovation Incentive, as proposed by the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, is a new line item involving reallocation of current higher education funding plus matching levels of performance funding to achieve a major restructuring and refocusing of Ohio's portfolio of doctoral research programs. It is the intent of this line item ultimately to build world-class research excellence and catalyze Ohio's economic growth in concert with the Third Frontier Project. The required reallocation of funds at the institutional level will, by definition, result in the downsizing, or complete elimination, of doctoral programs that are not performing at, or above, a level consistent with national norms. Anticipated significant positive outcomes to be achieved over a ten-year period include:

- 1) The achievement of selective excellence using enhanced funding for highly productive, highly effective doctoral programs that are aligned with Ohio's Third Frontier Project;
- 2) The attraction of preeminent senior research personnel to Ohio's universities who will catalyze Ohio's economic growth while developing research programs of both international and national distinction;
- 3) The recruitment of academically outstanding undergraduate and graduate students who will carry out significant research studies and support the development of first-class research programs;
- 4) The attraction of significantly higher levels of federal and industrial funding for research programs at Ohio's universities;
- 5) The achievement of enhanced economic growth at both the regional and state levels through the creation of new products and services to be commercialized by Ohio business and industry; and
- 6) The development of highly productive new collaborative research and doctoral education projects involving Wright Center research personnel working with Ohio's academic community of independent investigators and scholars.

Primary Objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program

Implementation of the Economic Growth Challenge / Innovation Incentive Program thus has four primary objectives:

1. Achieve enhanced program focus through effective doctoral program reallocation investments;
2. Attract preeminent researchers and build world-class research capacity;
3. Create new products and services to be commercialized, leading to job creation and economic growth in Ohio and in the regions of the state; and
4. Complement funding provided from programs included in Ohio's Third Frontier Project.

By shifting resources towards strong doctoral programs well aligned with Ohio's economic priorities, universities will be better able to contribute to Ohio's educational and economic growth. Matching state funds made available to qualifying universities through the Innovation Incentive Program will offer a timely stimulus for institutional reallocation and promise significant leverage through the Third Frontier Project for impressive results.

Institutional Eligibility

Each of Ohio's doctoral institutions, both state-assisted and independent, is eligible to compete for Innovation Incentive matching funds and, indeed, every state-assisted doctoral institution is expected to do so. Institutions with joint or collaborative doctoral program arrangements that are not participating directly in the Innovation Incentive Program are encouraged to participate as collaborating partner institutions according to a plan to be developed jointly by the partners.

Program Statement

Applications for Innovation Incentive Program funding are made through the submission of program statements from participating eligible institutions according to the timeline and application procedure given below.

There are three essential elements of a program statement (see also the Program Statement Guidelines in Appendix A that were developed by the Regents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Study):

- (a) The university must identify which of its doctoral programs qualify for strengthening through the reallocation of current institutional doctoral funds and through Innovation Incentive matching funds. Such identification should specify clearly the metrics by which the present strengths of the program are demonstrated, offer evidence for alignment of the program with the primary objectives of Innovation Incentive, as given above, and provide a clear description of program development opportunities the additional funding (both internal and external) will support.
- (b) The university will describe any measures it will use to determine the success of the recipient programs in addition to enhanced external research funding and the resulting increased share of Research Incentive.

- (c) The university must describe a credible prioritization process followed in determining programs identified as beneficiaries of additional funding. This process must embody the minimum reallocation expectations of the incentive: 15% of the universities' doctoral subsidies should be reallocated at the ten-year period (incrementing by 1.5% annually over ten years). For those institutions with credible prioritization processes in place prior to the inception of the Innovation Incentive Program, internal reallocation investments made since Fiscal Year 2003 may be included when accounting for the minimum institutional reallocation amount under Innovation Incentive. The Board of Regents encourages universities with established procedures for doctoral review to adapt those policies and procedures where possible to the priorities of the Innovation Incentive Program: enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, hiring preeminent research faculty, building world-class research capacity, stimulating economic growth, and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project.

Competitive Review Process

In the first year of the program, FY 2006, participating institutions will be required to reallocate the equivalent of 1.5% of their doctoral SSI, with additional 1.5% increments to be added in subsequent fiscal years, toward doctoral programs targeted for enhancement based upon their ability to achieve the primary objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program: enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, hiring preeminent research faculty, building world-class research capacity, stimulating economic growth, and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project.

As described in the original Regents-IUC document that provided basis for the Innovation Incentive, the competitive review process requires participating universities to successfully get over a series of hurdles, including internal and external peer review, that test the ability of proposed programs to meet the standards of eligibility for the Innovation Incentive Program. Universities whose proposals are not recommended by the external review panel or approved by the Regents will have a period of two years from the original deadline to remedy this. During that period, no state matching funds will be granted. If, at the end of two years, a given university does not have a satisfactory plan, as judged by a subsequent external peer review, beginning in FY 2008 it could lose all of its state match and, beginning in FY 2010, it could lose all of its state match plus up to half of its internal reallocation (0.75% per year of its doctoral SSI) to universities with stronger plans. If doctoral SSI loss is warranted, the loss will be cumulative: 3.75% in FY 2010, 4.50% in FY 2011, 5.25% in FY 2012, 6.00% in FY 2013, 6.75% in FY 2014, 7.50% in FY 2015.

If programs advanced by the participating universities fail to meet the established standards, the universities may lose the opportunity to compete for Innovation Incentive matching monies as well as the Funds At-Risk portion of internal state share of instruction (SSI) funds dedicated to doctoral education. Under this program, each institution's Funds At-Risk are defined as an amount equal to one-half of the minimally required internal reallocation amount (see Appendix B). Expectation values for each university's share of Innovation Incentive state matching funds may be estimated using an algorithm based on share of Funds At-Risk and share of Research Incentive Awards as described in more detail below.

There are three distinct time periods for ramping up the Innovation Incentive Program, each of which has distinct procedures for the competitive review process and a changing algorithm for estimating campus-specific expectation values for Innovation Incentive awards, as follows:

Transition Period: Competitive Review Process

The first two years of the Innovation Incentive Program, FY 2006 and FY 2007, are defined as the Transition Period. During both fiscal years of the Transition Period state matching funds will be provided only to those participating doctoral institutions that have made the minimally required doctoral program reallocations and successfully satisfied the concerns raised during the initial state-level review process. Some institutions may have state match withheld during the Transition Period until concerns have been satisfied.

As suggested by the timeline below, universities will receive reviews of their program statements in two stages. Following the May 26, 2006 deadline, Regents' staff will screen draft program statements for broad compliance with program expectations. This will not be a detailed editorial review, but will be limited to describing which program statements, if any, require substantive emendation or expansion.

Provisional program statements submitted on or before June 7, 2006 will be reviewed in more detail through a state-level peer review process involving representatives of Ohio's doctoral institutions. This review will offer each institution one of the following recommendations: (a) confirmed as a *qualified participant*, (b) *confirmed with reservations* (with a deadline for the resolution of such reservations), or (c) *provisionally declined* pending revision of the program statement by the submitting institution. An important element of this review will be a determination of whether each institution has achieved the minimally required level of reallocation investment using a credible outcomes-based priority-setting review process.

Regents' staff, in consultation with institutional representatives on the Economic Growth Challenge Planning Committee, will convene an initial state-level peer review panel to evaluate campus program statements (see Program Statement Guidelines above and in Appendix A).

Following the initial state-level peer review (and response as necessary) of program statements by a suitable panel of Ohio-based higher education officials convened by Regents' staff, universities may be confirmed as: 1) *qualified participants*; 2) *confirmed with reservations* (with a deadline for having the reservations addressed); or 3) *provisionally declined* pending revision by the submitting institution. Funding for qualified participants in FY 2006 will align closely with the expectation values estimated using an algorithm based 50% on institutional share of Funds At-Risk and 50% on institutional share of Research Incentive Awards. Funding for qualified participants during both FY 2007 and FY 2008 will be determined by the results of an external peer review to be conducted during the spring of 2007. Innovation Incentive awards in FY 2007 and FY 2008 will correspond with the expectation values as modified by the quality scores assigned by the external review panel. Similarly, funding for qualified participants during FY 2009 and FY 2010 will be determined by the results of an external peer review to be carried out during the spring of 2009, and Innovation Incentive awards for these

two fiscal years will correspond with the expectation values as modified by the quality scores assigned by the second external review panel.

Toward the end of the Transition Period, during the spring of 2007, participating universities will be required to submit fully revised and updated Innovation Incentive program statements. Regents' staff, in consultation with institutional representatives on the Economic Growth Challenge Planning Committee, will convene an external review panel consisting of experts in the disciplines who work and reside outside of Ohio. This group will be charged with the responsibility of carrying out an evaluation of the revised campus program statements. Again, universities may be confirmed as *qualified participants, confirmed with reservations* (with a deadline for having the reservations addressed), or *provisionally declined* pending revision by the submitting institution. This competitive peer review will follow extensive consultation by the universities within their respective regions of the state, including especially with the Regional Technology Councils or analogous higher education-business groups. Further details regarding this review as well as guidelines for revising program statements in response to critical concerns raised by external reviewers will be developed in due course.

The external review panel will base its funding recommendations on the potential as well as the realized effectiveness of the reallocation investments that directly relate to the objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program: enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, hiring preeminent research faculty, building world-class research capacity, stimulating economic growth, and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project. The level of individual campus awards will be set according to a mix of each institution's share of Funds At-Risk and Research Incentive Awards as modified by the quality scores assigned by the external review panel. Higher scoring institutions will be anticipated to receive state matching funds that exceed the corresponding expectation values, while lower scoring institutions will receive state matching funds that are less than expectation values.

Start-Up Operation Period: Competitive Review Process

The third and fourth years of the Innovation Incentive Program, FY 2008 and FY 2009, are defined as the Start-Up Operation Period. Innovation Incentive funding for FY 2007 and FY 2008 will have already been determined through the work of the first external review panel during the spring of 2007, while funding in FY 2009 and FY 2010 will be recommended by the second external review panel during the spring of 2009.

In the middle of the Start-Up Operation Period, during the spring of 2009, participating universities will be required to submit fully revised and updated Innovation Incentive program statements. Regents' staff, in consultation with institutional representatives on the Economic Growth Challenge Planning Committee, will convene an external review panel consisting of experts in the disciplines who work and reside outside of Ohio. This group will be charged with the responsibility of carrying out an evaluation of the revised campus program statements. Again, universities may be confirmed as *qualified participants, confirmed with reservations* (with a deadline for having the reservations addressed), or *provisionally declined* pending revision by the submitting institution. This competitive peer review will follow extensive consultation by the universities within their respective regions of the state, including especially with the Regional Technology Councils or analogous higher education-business groups. The 2009 external review panel will base its funding recommendations for FY 2009 and FY 2010 on the realized

effectiveness of the reallocation investments that directly relate to the objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program: enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, hiring preeminent research faculty, building world-class research capacity, stimulating economic growth, and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project. Institutions will also be expected to identify the specific doctoral programs that have been subject to reductions in funding over the time period of the Innovation Incentive Program. Further details regarding this review as well as guidelines for revising program statements in response to critical concerns raised by external reviewers will be developed in due course.

In FY 2009 and FY 2010 state matching funds will be provided to those participating doctoral institutions that have successfully competed against the other institutions and fully met the standards established during the first biennial external peer review in 2007. The funding levels established following the 2007 external review will be the starting point for the 2009 external review panel in recommending awards for FY 2009 and FY 2010. The level of individual campus awards in FY 2009 and FY 2010 will be set according to a mix of each institution's share of Funds At-Risk and Research Incentive Awards as modified by the quality scores assigned by the 2009 external review panel. Higher scoring institutions will be anticipated to receive state matching funds that exceed the corresponding expectation values, while lower scoring institutions will receive state matching funds that are less than expectation values. It should be noted that some institutions might lose state match if they fail to qualify for any one of several reasons, such as not meeting the Innovation Incentive standards for enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, building world-class research capacity and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project, not making the minimally required internal reallocations of doctoral SSI, not having a credible outcomes-based priority-setting review process, or not satisfying the concerns raised during the preliminary state-level review. The minimally required internal doctoral program reallocations are given in Appendix B, where dollar amounts are computed by institution and by fiscal year using 1.5% annual increments of normalized doctoral SSI shares or, for independent institutions, using 1.5% annual increments of the FY 2000-2004 share values for Base Doc I Equivalent Graduates.


Full Operation Period: Competitive Review Process

In the second year of the Full Operation Period, during the spring of 2011, Regents' staff, in consultation with the participating universities, will consider plans to convene a third external review panel to evaluate revised program statements and make recommendations to the Regents for Innovation Incentive funding awards in FY 2011 and FY 2012.

During FY 2011-2015, as well as all subsequent years of the program, state matching funds, plus any recovered doctoral SSI funds, will be provided to those participating institutions that have successfully competed against the other institutions and fully met the standards established during the most recent biennial peer review. Some institutions may lose state match plus 0.75% per year of doctoral SSI at this point. If doctoral SSI loss is warranted, the loss will be cumulative: 3.75% in FY 2010, 4.50% in FY 2011, 5.25% in FY 2012, 6.00% in FY 2013, 6.75% in FY 2014, 7.50% in FY 2015.

Expectation Values for Innovation Incentive Program Awards

In the determination of expectation values for Innovation Incentive Program awards, the ratio of Funds At-Risk to Research Incentive Awards will change over the first ten years of the Innovation Incentive Program from 50:50 to 25:75 as given in the table below.

	Transition Period: Funding will be provided unless concerns raised in preliminary state-level review are not satisfied		Start-Up Operation Period: After initial external peer review—some institutions may lose state match		Full Operation Period: If proposed programs at some universities fail to meet standards, state match and half of internal reallocations will be redistributed across institutions according to an external review process					
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Percent Share of Funds At-Risk	50%	50%	 45%	45%	40%	40%	35%	35%	30%	25%
Percent Share of Research Incentive Awards	50%	50%	55%	55%	60%	60%	65%	65%	70%	75%

Inclusion of Independent Universities

The enabling legislation directs Regents to include Ohio's two independent doctoral degree-granting universities. If Case Western Reserve University and the University of Dayton choose to participate, they are required to set aside an amount comparable to the state-assisted universities in order to provide internal, add-on investments for the doctoral programs chosen for enhancement at each campus. Since the customary calculation of doctoral SSI does not include the independent universities, a new approach is required in order to have a consistent scale for measuring the doctoral program productivities of the independent institutions. The chosen metric is total number of doctoral graduates over the most recent five-year period as reported to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the Higher Education Information (HEI) System. As it turns out, calculating percent share of doctoral SSI on the basis of full-time equivalent doctoral students (FTEs) or on the basis of total doctoral graduates gives very similar results. A mixed approach, therefore, using normalized shares of doctoral SSI at state-assisted institutions and shares of Base Doc I Equivalent

Doctoral Graduates at independent institutions will be employed to calculate the minimally required internal reallocation amount at each doctoral degree-granting university (see Appendix B). Each institution's Funds At-Risk are defined to be one-half of its minimum internal reallocation amount as given in Appendix B.

Application Procedure

Participating institutions will be required to post their completed program statements on an internal web page using password protection according to the due dates given in the timeline below. An email providing the url and needed password for accessing the institution's program statement should be sent by each participating institution's chief academic officer to the Innovation Incentive Program coordinator on or before the appropriate deadline date. All program statements should begin with a cover page modeled after the blank format given below following Appendix C identifying the members of the Economic Growth Challenge Planning Committee.

Timeline

In order to expedite the allocation of funds set aside by the state for the support of doctoral programs that support Ohio's long-range economic priorities, implementation of Innovation Incentive must occur during spring 2006. The proposed timeline below provides substantial time for on-campus consideration, offers opportunity for a pre-review of proposals by Board of Regents' staff, and allows for pre-confirmation of qualifying universities through the state-level peer review process before the conclusion of the current fiscal year.

March 27, 2006	Guidelines and timetable for implementation of Innovation Incentive distributed to all universities.
May 26, 2006	Draft program statements due for initial screening to Board of Regents' staff.
May 31, 2006	Board of Regents' advisories for substantive revision returned to universities.
June 7, 2006	Universities submit provisional program statements to Board of Regents.
June 12, 2006	Following preliminary review (and response as necessary) of program statements by a state-level panel, universities may be confirmed as qualified participants, confirmed with reservations (with a deadline for having the reservations addressed), or provisionally declined pending revision by the submitting institution.
June 15, 2006	On the basis of staff reviews and approval by a designated state-level review panel, the Board of Regents approves initial allocations of Innovation Incentive Program funding. Any institutions failing to meet the necessary standard for participation in Innovation Incentive will have up to two more years to meet that standard, during which time they lose the opportunity to compete for Innovation Incentive state matching funds.

March 26, 2007	Revised program statements due for initial screening to Board of Regents' staff.
April 9, 2007	Board of Regents' advisories for substantive revision returned to universities.
April 30, 2007	Universities submit updated and fully revised program statements to Board of Regents.
May 28, 2007	Following competitive review (and response as necessary) of program statements by an external panel of experts convened by Regents' staff, universities may be confirmed as qualified participants, confirmed with reservations (with a deadline for having the reservations addressed), or provisionally declined pending revision by the submitting institution. The external review panel will base its funding recommendations on documented outcomes that directly relate to the objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program: enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, hiring preeminent research faculty, building world-class research capacity, stimulating economic growth, and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project.
June 21, 2007	On the basis of staff reviews and approval by the external peer review panel, the Board of Regents approves allocations of Innovation Incentive Program funding. Any institutions failing to meet the necessary standard for participation in Innovation Incentive will have two more years to meet that standard, during which time they lose 100% of the state Innovation Incentive matching funds.
March 30, 2009	Revised program statements due for initial screening to Board of Regents' staff.
April 13, 2009	Board of Regents' advisories for substantive revision returned to universities.
May 4, 2009	Universities submit updated and fully revised program statements to Board of Regents.
June 1, 2009	Following competitive review (and response as necessary) of program statements by an external panel of experts convened by Regents' staff, universities may be confirmed as qualified participants, confirmed with reservations (with a deadline for having the reservations addressed), or provisionally declined pending revision by the submitting institution. The external review panel will base its funding recommendations on documented outcomes that directly relate to the objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program: enhancing program focus through effective reallocation of doctoral program resources, hiring preeminent research faculty, building world-class research capacity, stimulating economic growth, and complementing Ohio's Third Frontier Project.

June 18, 2009 On the basis of staff reviews and approval by the external peer review panel, the Board of Regents approves allocations of Innovation Incentive Program funding. Any institutions failing to meet the necessary standard for participation in Innovation Incentive will have two more years to meet that standard, during which time they lose 100% of the state Innovation Incentive matching funds plus 50% of the reallocated doctoral SSI.

Program Coordination

The Innovation Incentive Program will be coordinated by Dr. A. Harry Andrist, Director of Research and Graduate Programs, Ohio Board of Regents, who may be contacted at 614-752-9539 or handrist@regents.state.oh.us.

Appendix A

Program Statement Guidelines

Each university's Innovation Incentive program statement should include the following elements:

Area(s) of program investment- This section describes the research areas in which the university will invest. Provide a rationale for investment in each area including:

- (a) a brief description of the research area and its general importance,
- (b) an explanation of the area's relevance to the Economic Growth Challenge program and economic development in Ohio,
- (c) current institutional strengths in the area (in terms of current research funding, recent institutional investments, university infrastructure, connections to industry, publications, intellectual property, participation in Wright Centers, etc.).

Doctoral programs supporting the areas of Investment- This section identifies the doctoral program(s) that will support activities in each of the areas of investment. Information regarding the current faculty and doctoral students in each program should be included as well as an explanation of the connection between the area(s) of research investment and the doctoral program. A table (as shown below) may be included that summarizes the doctoral programs defined to be within each investment area:

Hypothetical Areas of Investment (for illustration only)

	Cancer	Propulsion	Nanotechnology	Sustainable Development	Medical Imaging
Biomedical Engineering	•				•
Aerospace Engineering		•			
Materials Science			•	•	
Chemistry			•		
Molecular Genetics	•				
Environmental Health	•			•	
Physics			•		•

•- indicates participation of a doctoral program in an area of investment

Enhancement Plan -This section provides a description of the overall goal of the investment and timeframe in which that goal will be achieved. In addition, this section should lay out the detailed investment plan to achieve the stated goals, such as faculty recruitment, enhanced doctoral student enrollment and/or support, new and/or improved facilities, etc. In cases where investment in multiple areas is proposed, a discussion of the complementary nature of these investments should be provided.

Finally, this section should include an assessment plan (including metrics) through which progress toward the stated goals will be evaluated.

Prioritization process- Each plan must include a description of the process by which the evaluation of all of an institution's doctoral programs will be linked to Innovation Incentive Program investments (including both institutional matching funds and new funding from the Economic Growth Challenge program). Investments extending back to Fiscal Year 2003 may be included. Universities are encouraged to adapt established procedures for doctoral review where possible.

Appendix B

Internal Doctoral Program Reallocations by Institution Computed Using 1.5% Annual Increments of Doctoral SSI with Normalized Current Share Values of Doctoral SSI for State-Assisted Institutions and Base Doc I Equivalent Graduates for Independent Institutions

As a condition of participation in the Innovation Incentive Program each institution must reallocate annually increasing portions of its internal doctoral program funding. The minimum reallocation amount for each institution is a function of its normalized share of doctoral SSI, for state-assisted institutions, or its share of Doc I Equivalent Graduates, for independent institutions, as well as the total amount of matching moneys provided by the state. The table below presents Innovation Incentive Program minimum internal reallocations by fiscal year and by institution using 1.5% annual increments of the current total doctoral SSI in constant FY 2006 dollars. The Funds At-Risk for each institution can be estimated by taking one-half of the values in the table.

Innovation Incentive Program Minimum Internal Reallocations (Figures Represent Double the Amount of Funds At-Risk in Constant 2006 Dollars)					
University	% Normalized Share Doctoral SSI or % Share Doc I Equivalent Graduates	FY 2006 Matching Allocations	FY 2007 Matching Allocations	FY 2008 Matching Allocations	FY 2009 Matching Allocations
Ohio State University	36.32%	\$857,842	\$1,715,685	\$2,573,527	\$3,431,369
University of Cincinnati	16.17%	\$381,919	\$763,839	\$1,145,758	\$1,527,677
Case Western Reserve University	12.27%	\$289,805	\$579,610	\$869,416	\$1,159,221
Kent State University	7.18%	\$169,584	\$339,169	\$508,753	\$678,338
Ohio University	6.08%	\$143,604	\$287,207	\$430,811	\$574,414
University of Akron	5.44%	\$128,487	\$256,975	\$385,462	\$513,950
Bowling Green State University	4.90%	\$115,733	\$231,466	\$347,199	\$462,933
University of Toledo	2.12%	\$50,072	\$100,145	\$150,217	\$200,289
Miami University	3.13%	\$73,927	\$147,855	\$221,782	\$295,710
Cleveland State University	1.23%	\$29,051	\$58,103	\$87,154	\$116,206
University of Dayton	1.89%	\$44,640	\$89,280	\$133,920	\$178,560
Medical University of Ohio	0.84%	\$19,840	\$39,680	\$59,520	\$79,360
Wright State University	2.43%	\$57,394	\$114,788	\$172,183	\$229,577
Total	100.00%	\$2,361,901	\$4,723,801	\$7,085,702	\$9,447,602

Innovation Incentive Program Minimum Internal Reallocations

(Figures Represent Double the Amount of Funds At-Risk in Constant 2006 Dollars)

FY 2010 Matching Allocations	FY 2011 Matching Allocations	FY 2012 Matching Allocations	FY 2013 Matching Allocations	FY 2014 Matching Allocations	FY 2015 Matching Allocations	University
\$4,289,211	\$5,147,054	\$6,004,896	\$6,862,738	\$7,720,581	\$8,578,423	Ohio State University
\$1,909,597	\$2,291,516	\$2,673,435	\$3,055,355	\$3,437,274	\$3,819,193	University of Cincinnati
\$1,449,026	\$1,738,831	\$2,028,636	\$2,318,442	\$2,608,247	\$2,898,052	Case Western Reserve U
\$847,922	\$1,017,507	\$1,187,091	\$1,356,676	\$1,526,260	\$1,695,845	Kent State University
\$718,018	\$861,621	\$1,005,225	\$1,148,828	\$1,292,432	\$1,436,036	Ohio University
\$642,437	\$770,924	\$899,412	\$1,027,899	\$1,156,387	\$1,284,874	University of Akron
\$578,666	\$694,399	\$810,132	\$925,865	\$1,041,598	\$1,157,331	Bowling Green State U
\$250,361	\$300,434	\$350,506	\$400,578	\$450,651	\$500,723	University of Toledo
\$369,637	\$443,565	\$517,492	\$591,420	\$665,347	\$739,275	Miami University
\$145,257	\$174,308	\$203,360	\$232,411	\$261,462	\$290,514	Cleveland State University
\$223,200	\$267,840	\$312,479	\$357,119	\$401,759	\$446,399	University of Dayton
\$99,200	\$119,040	\$138,880	\$158,720	\$178,560	\$198,400	Medical University of Ohio
\$286,971	\$344,365	\$401,759	\$459,153	\$516,548	\$573,942	Wright State University
\$11,809,503	\$14,171,403	\$16,533,304	\$18,895,204	\$21,257,105	\$23,619,006	Total

Appendix C

Economic Growth Challenge Planning Committee

Elizabeth J. Stroble
Senior Vice President and Provost and Chief Operating Officer
University of Akron

John Folkins
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Bowling Green State University

J. Christopher Dalton
Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration
Bowling Green State University

John Anderson
Provost and University Vice President
Case Western Reserve University

Chin Y. Kuo
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Cleveland State University

Robert A. Frank
Interim University Dean of the Graduate School
University of Cincinnati

Anthony J. Perzigian
Senior Vice President and Provost
University of Cincinnati

Fred P. Pestello
Provost and Senior Vice President for Educational Affairs
University of Dayton

David K. Creamer
Vice President for Administration
Kent State University

Paul L. Gaston
Provost
Kent State University

Jeffrey Gold
Dean of the College of Medicine
Medical University of Ohio

Jeffrey I. Herbst
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Miami University

Mark A. Penn
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Executive Associate Dean
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine

Barbara R. Snyder
Executive Vice President and Provost
Ohio State University

Kathy Krendl
Provost
Ohio University

Alan G. Goodridge
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Enrollment
University of Toledo

David R. Hopkins
Provost
Wright State University

Joseph F. Thomas, Jr.
Vice President for Research and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Research
Wright State University

Robert K. Herbert
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Youngstown State University

Frank Samuel
Governor's Science and Technology Advisor
Governor's Office

Shaun Yoder
Policy Analyst
Education and Workforce Development
Governor's Office

Tracy Najera
OBM Analyst
Office of Budget and Management

E. Garrison Walters
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Economic Advancement
Ohio Board of Regents

Richard L. Petrick
Vice Chancellor for Finance
Ohio Board of Regents

A. Harry Andrist
Director of Research and Graduate Programs
Ohio Board of Regents

Innovation Incentive Program

Ohio Board of Regents

Fiscal Years 2006-07

1. Institution and Chief Academic Officer

Institution: _____
Street/Building/P.O. Box Number: _____
City: _____ State: OH Zip Code: _____
Chief Academic Officer: _____
Chief Academic Officer's Title: _____
Email: _____
Telephone Number: _____ Fax: _____

2. Program Statement Information

Program Statement Working Title: _____

Lead College, Department, Institute, or Academic Program: _____
Academic Department(s) Involved: _____

3. Program Statement Budget

State Matching Funds Requested for FY 2006-07: _____
Doctoral Program Reallocation Investments Total for FY 2006-07: _____
Additional Institutional Cost-Share for FY 2006-07: _____
Total Budget for FY 2006-07: _____

4. Collaborating Institutions and Organizations (if appropriate)

5. Institutional Certification and Endorsement

The signature of the institution's chief academic officer below certifies that the information contained in this program statement is accurate and, further, that the institution endorses the objectives of the Innovation Incentive Program by agreeing to make the specific doctoral program reallocation investments outlined in the attached program statement.

Chief Academic Officer: _____ Title: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____